

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 14 and 15 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (U.S. Pat. No. 6,577,874) in view of Alley, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,264). Claim 1 has been amended to include the step of varying the length of the partial address to ensure uniqueness of the partial address.

Dailey discloses assigning a temporary ID that has a length shorter than a nominal ID. Dailey does not disclose a non-unique temporary ID and Dailey does not disclose a temporary ID that is defined using a portion of the nominal ID. Alley discloses using the least significant byte of an address (instead of a full address) after a link is established. Thus, a partial address is disclosed but the length of the address is not varied as is now defined in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 4-7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Alley, et al., and further in view of Rossin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,143). Claim 8 has been amended to define that the partial address length may vary between slots.

The above discussion of Dailey and Alley, et al. apply here also. In addition, Rossin does not disclose varying the length of the partial address. Rossin discloses comparing ID numbers to stored ID numbers to determine if the ID number is already stored. There is nothing disclosed regarding the varying of the length of the partial address.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 8, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 9, 12 and 13, which ultimately depend from Claim 8, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Fan, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,625,124). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Fan, et al. as applied to Claim 14 above, and further in view of Alley, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,264). Claim 14 has been amended to define that the partial address length may vary between slots.

The above discussion regarding Dailey applies here also. Fan discloses using a short address (reduced length) as a substitute for long (or standard) addresses for traffic internal to a network. Short address length depends on the number of reachable devices within a network topology. The “short addresses are locally unique” (column 3, line 34). A short address is related to a long address by a lookup table (column 6, lines 39-40). The short address is not disclosed as being a partial address or even a part of a mobile address.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 14, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 17, which depends from Claim 14, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 depended from Claim 1. Claim 2 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 1 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claim 3 depends from Claim 2.

Claim 10 depended from Claim 9, which depended from Claim 8. Claim 10 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 8 and 9 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claim 11 depends from Claim 10.

Claim 15 depended from Claim 14. Claim 15 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 14 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claim 16 depends from Claim 15.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg